

said earlier, I think we have a constitutional obligation to do it. A member of my staff has been saying this, Ryan Keating, no one likes to be the bad parent. No one likes to be the one who comes in and says, You know what, you're grounded. You're not doing this right, to be the enforcer. It would be nice to always be nice but someone has got to question what is going on here because we are losing lives, we are losing people because of these misjudgments. And then this Chalabi who gave us all this information on how great the war was going to be, and that was another one, we were going to be greeted as liberators, not occupiers. We are 800 dead later, most of that happening after we have toppled Saddam and the statue was pulled down.

Now everyone is saying that this Chalabi, well, we never really worked with him. We knew him, we talked to him, but we get advice from everybody. He was sitting up in the Chamber when the President gave his State of the Union address, right behind Mrs. Bush.

I do not like to be the bad parent. I do not have kids. I am not a parent in any sense. But I think the point is well taken that somebody has to say, what is going wrong here, and I think there is a growing frustration among the American people. It is not just Democrats. It is not just Democrats. It is the frustration that I think you see when we see the President's hometown newspaper editorializing against him I think is a pretty good sign that people better start shooting straight. The problem is you cannot put the bullet back in the gun. The bullet is out of gun. We have got to make the best of a bad situation and work with our soldiers to make sure that we do not lose any more of them while they are over there.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me correct myself. It is one of the home State newspapers in Dallas. I know that the American people associate the President with Crawford, Texas. Let me just say very quickly that we encourage the e-mails that we have been receiving. The gentleman can give our e-mail address out and then I will give another e-mail address out, but the gentleman from Ohio can go ahead and do that. David Letterman has his Top 10. You have the e-mail. I am going to give out this e-mail address so I do not want to take that away from the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This is mine. This is my role.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. This is your role.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You are not going to take it away from me?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No, sir.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. 30 Something Working Group. Send us an e-mail. 30SomethingDems@mail.house.gov.

Send us an e-mail. We would love to hear from you. We would love to hear what you have to say. We have to continue to have these discussions. Again, as we started, this is not personal. We

need, you and I hopefully in our own little way, to raise the level of debate here to say it is not venomous, it is not malicious, it is not personal. We do not mean to personally attack anybody, but there are some real policy concerns. In a time of war, I think we have even more of a responsibility to do it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. In closing, I just want to say that our next 30 Something hour will be on Tuesday, July 6. That is after Independence Day which is going to be a festive celebration, I understand, here in Washington, D.C. There will be fireworks on the Mall to celebrate our independence once again. They can check the Web site which is the Democratic Leader Web site, democraticleader.house.gov/ 30something to get that information. I would also like to commend the WWE which is our wrestling component here, World Wrestling Entertainment, for their voter registration effort of the 18 to 30 demographics.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4548, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-561) on the resolution (H. Res. 686) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4548) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2100

SANCTUARY CITY POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, we have had an interesting discussion for the last hour on the issue of security of the homeland and whether or not our efforts in Iraq are on track, whether or not we are doing the right thing. It is intriguing to me to listen to this discussion for a variety of reasons because, regardless of whether or not anyone believes that our efforts in Iraq are right and honorable and good, I have yet to meet anyone who believes that the need to defend the homeland from terrorist attack is not greater than it has ever been.

One may disagree entirely with whether the decisions made by the President have been appropriate; but no one says, no one has dared to say that we should do anything but aggressively pursue policies that are designed to make us more secure from terrorists

who we know are out there, whether or not they conspired with the Iraqi Government, with Saddam Hussein, or whether or not our efforts in Iraq will lessen that particular threat. The reality is we know we have a threat and we know that we should be doing everything possible to, in fact, defend ourselves against that threat. That is a given. No one argued it.

Now, amazingly, Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I brought forward to the floor of the House an amendment to the Homeland Security Appropriations Act, and I have to give just a little bit of background to help explain exactly what the amendment was all about because there are people who are perhaps viewing this tonight who really are not sure. But let me explain that Members of the Congress knew exactly what this was all about.

There are, in fact, a number of cities and States around the country that are pursuing policies that we describe as sanctuary city policies. In the case of a State, the State of Maine is contemplating and actually has proposed that they become a sanctuary State. What does that mean? Sanctuary from what? Sanctuary from investigation by the Bureau of Immigration Control and Enforcement. Because there are cities, there are localities that are saying that they will not allow their police forces, for instance, to, in fact, report the arrest or the detention of anyone who is here illegally. They will not allow their police force to report that to the Bureau of Immigration Control and Enforcement because there is a desire to eliminate the category of illegal immigrant from the whole lexicon. And so this is happening throughout the country.

Why is this significant? In 1994, the Congress of the United States passed a law, and the law said that no city or State could, in fact, impede the flow of information to the Bureau, which then it was INS, or from the INS so that we could be helped, the Federal Government could be aided, in our efforts to try to control illegal immigration. That is on the books. I was not even in the Congress of the United States when that particular proposal was accepted and passed into law. But it is the law. That is the given. We have a law that says that they cannot hide these people, that no State or city can provide sanctuary for people who are living here illegally; but, of course, the unfortunate aspect of that particular law is that it did not include any penalty provision.

So cities and States are doing it. They are doing it all over the country, and they are doing it to the detriment not just to the security of the United States of America but to the security of their own people in cities and States where these things are in place because we have seen cases where people who are here illegally and who had been arrested in the past for being here illegally, but not turned into the Bureau of Immigration Control and Enforcement, were then allowed to go back on

to the streets and commit other crimes, some of them heinous crimes.

In New York, four people raped, brutally raped, a woman. And at least two of the four, perhaps three, were actually people who had been in the past detained, found out to be here illegally, but not given over to the INS and therefore not deported. So there are people being affected by this in the most horrible ways. The story I just told is replicated hundreds, if not thousands, of times across this country.

There was a march in Los Angeles about a month ago, 2,000 people participated. It was a march to protest the policies of the government that have allowed illegal immigrants to come into this country and perpetrate horrendous crimes and then essentially escape punishment.

Not only, as I say, is this practice of sanctuary cities and sanctuary States, not only is it a threat to the peace and security of the people who live in those cities and States; it is also a threat to the security of the United States of America. There are people who have come into this country illegally not just for the purpose of obtaining a job that no one else would take. I guess one could say maybe some of these people came in to do a crime that no American would do because there are plenty of them that are committing crimes.

Four hundred thousand people are here in this country, having come into this country, having actually gone to a court of law, an immigration law court, and been ordered to be deported because of some violation of our law even beyond the fact that they were here illegally. They had done something else. They had murdered, raped, robbed, done some other thing. They have walked out and walked into American society, and we have not the foggiest idea where they are. Four hundred thousand people in that category.

Among those people who come into this country illegally just for the purpose of taking a job that no one else would take, as we hear so often, are people who are coming here for very, very bad things, to do bad things, bad reasons. Some of them are coming in to kill every single person here who does not agree with their perverted view of the world and because their religion tells them that they cannot live in a world in which free people can accept or, in fact, turn down the opportunity to join their religious perspective.

And so, therefore, when we do things like allow sanctuary city policies to exist, we do a lot of bad things. First of all, of course, we create literally hundreds of different immigration policies around the country. So it is not just the United States of America that has a policy about immigration, which, by the way, is one of the few powers given to this Federal Government by the Constitution. We have, of course, usurped many other powers and duties and responsibilities that the Constitution does not provide, but this one is

truly a Federal Government responsibility. And we do not do a very good job of enforcing the law or accepting our responsibility. It is true. But we do not need the problems created by cities and States that are captivated by the cult of multiculturalism and who have passed these bizarre laws. We do not need that.

So I proposed an amendment to the Homeland Security appropriations bill, and it simply said that no city or State that does this, that actually puts in place a proposal of this kind, can receive funding from the Homeland Security Act. Again, I have said oftentimes that I often wonder what would happen if we were to actually just put that amendment out, and many others that deal with immigration, but if we were just to put that out to the public and see how they would vote on it. Mr. Speaker, I guarantee the Members that the response would be overwhelmingly supportive. In this Congress, regardless of all the rhetoric we heard from the other side tonight about their intent to support national security, they just disagree with Iraq, regardless of all that rhetoric, the fact is that all but two Democrats in the House of Representatives voted against the amendment. Sixty-eight Republicans voted against it. We had 148 Members voting in support.

This is not a tough issue. It is not complicated. It is very, very upfront. And we had 148 Members. This is, by the way, about 20 Members more than we had last year on the amendment; and we will do this again, by the way, in a short time on the Commerce, Justice, and State bill. I am going to propose a similar amendment, and I will propose an amendment of this nature for as long as I am able to, as long as I am a Member of the House and until it passes. And I will propose a variety of other amendments, and I will propose legislation dealing with immigration and immigration reform regardless of the fact that we are, as I say, facing this cult of multiculturalism and the bloc that it represents that prevent us from doing anything significant in terms of immigration reform.

Of course, that group of people who are here, who are captivated by this concept of radical multiculturalism and refuse to think about the possibility that America's own identity is at stake in this debate over immigration, they are allies of other groups in the Congress, other very powerful interest groups. One, of course, is the Democratic Party that sees massive immigration of legal and illegal aliens into this country as a terrific source of voters, both present and future, because many people who are here illegally go ahead and vote. So the Democratic Party knows that they vote mostly for them; and therefore they will not do anything to restrict the flow of immigration, either legal or illegal, into the country.

On our side, unfortunately, there are too many people who are committed to

the allure of cheap labor. So the Republican side listens to the political interest groups that rely on cheap labor, and they say to us, do not stop that flow.

So we put all those things together, the sort of radical multiculturalists, the political opportunists, and the cheap labor lobby; and we realize that we are here essentially unable to do anything significant in terms of immigration reform.

And I want to say that I am so proud of the 148 people that stood with me on this issue and will certainly face the wrath of these particular interest groups.

But it is, again, ironic that we sat here and listened to all this talk about national security and the need to have it, just not to be pursuing the war in Iraq. Okay. Again, whatever side one is on on that policy, that is fine; and we can certainly argue it.

□ 2115

But it is amazing to me that we could find only two Democrats that would actually support a proposal to make our country more secure by simply enforcing the law. Is that not incredible when you think about it? It is a law this body passed. How hypocritical, to have passed this law thinking, hoping, that it would never be enforced, and that any attempt to do so would be a threat to the philosophy of radical multi-culturalism, cheap labor and political opportunity.

But that is the way it is. As the commentator said, that is the way it is here, and it is something we are going to have to deal with. I assure you, I will continue to propose these kinds of measures, to try to put people on record so that constituents can see exactly what happened.

Now, everything can be spun in a variety of ways, and I have seen attempts by people who voted against this amendment to say they were really voting for national security because they wanted the money for their communities, and even if their communities had declared themselves to be sanctuary cities that would not report illegal aliens that they had come in contact with, that that is okay; it is more important to get the money.

Well, do you know what? We should not reward people or cities or States for violating the law. There is not a Member of this House that can I think in good faith can say they believe we should reward people for breaking the law, but that is exactly what we are doing. Every single grant that we hand out, every single tax break that we give, anything that we provide for cities that are in fact violating the Federal law is an advantage to them.

It is amazing. Again, I say, it is amazing, and I surely hope that anyone who is observing this tonight will check and see exactly how their representative voted. If they agree with it, tell them, and if they do not, I hope they do that too, Mr. Speaker.

There will be a number of other proposals that I will put forward in the near future. One will deal with the issue of remittances. Again, this takes a bit of explanation.

Remittances. What are remittances? Well, it turns out that millions and millions of people who are here in this country, most of whom are here illegally, are employed, and they take part of the salary they make at their job, and sometimes I have seen estimates of up to 50 percent of the people who are here illegally are employed off the books. That is to say, we are not getting any tax dollars from them. They are not paying into workman's comp, Social Security or anything else of that nature. But they take the dollars that they are making and they send them home to relatives in other countries.

A report just came out not too long ago saying that about \$30 billion a year flows out of the United States just to Latin America in the form of remittances. There are seven or eight countries in the world that have more than 10 percent of their gross domestic product coming to them in the form of remittances from the United States or countries outside their boundaries, but primarily from the United States; \$30 billion alone to Latin America.

Where does this money come from? It comes, of course, from the people who work here; who, if they were not sending that money home, they would be investing it in the communities in which they live. But since they are not, those communities are denied the benefits of that multiplier effect. The jobs are not being created, the economy is not being stimulated in these communities, and the money is going primarily south.

So, I have been thinking about this for a while, and when I saw this report I felt that maybe something could be done in the following manner: We every year send billions of dollars overseas to many countries in the form of foreign aid. Much of this money, as everyone knows, ends up in the hands of corrupt dictators or corrupt governments, even if they call themselves democratically-elected, and it oftentimes never, ever, ever gets to the most worthy recipient.

So I am going to propose an amendment to the foreign operations bill that says that every dollar that we send in the form of a remittance to some other country will be deducted from the money we send them in the form of foreign aid.

Now, this will be quite controversial, of course. It should not be controversial to any Member of the Congress of the United States. It will certainly be opposed by the governments of Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, Jordan and Haiti. All of these countries will be furious at the possibility that their check will be reduced by the amount of money that their nationals are sending back to people in their country.

But, after all, Mr. Speaker, if in fact foreign aid is simply the transfer of

wealth from one country to another, then why is a remittance not that same thing? In fact, it is going to people who probably really need it, and it is far more efficient, far more efficient than the check we send to corrupt governments in terms of the usage.

So I am going to propose that. And we have a couple of other things we will be dealing with. Of course, we have a lot of legislation that we think this body ought to consider that will improve our immigration policy dramatically.

There are organizations like NumbersUSA, which people can identify by simply going to that site, NumbersUSA.com, and they are very heavily involved with trying to promote immigration reform efforts. There are people and groups all over the country of this ilk. We hear from them all the time.

When I get done on the floor of the House with these special orders and go back to my office, oftentimes the phones are lit up, or the e-mails are coming in from people all over, and 99.9 percent are quite supportive of our efforts, and I know that most Americans are supportive of our efforts. In fact, if we put any of these issues out there for a debate, for a vote, a national plebiscite, if you will, of course, we do not have that in America, but if we did have such a thing as a national election on issues that could be brought by citizens, all of these things would win overwhelmingly. It is only the stubborn reluctance to allow the people of this country to work their will on this issue that prevents us from doing so in this body.

But things are changing, Mr. Speaker, and are getting a lot better for our side. The momentum is definitely shifting to us. I have been in this Congress now 6 years, and I assure you if anyone had proposed a guest worker plan that included some sort of amnesty provision for people here illegally, if they proposed this a couple of years ago it would have gone through here without much opposition. I would have, of course, opposed it, but I would have been in the very small minority.

Things are changing. There are five or six different bills being proposed by very powerful Members of both the House and the Senate, and these bills all include a provision for amnesty. They are hidden most of the time; they obfuscate, they call it different things, ag-jobs, agricultural jobs. But all of them have that one common theme, except for the bill I have proposed, H.R. 3534; all the rest include some form of amnesty.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that any one of those bills would have passed through this body, as I say, a couple of years ago, just like that. But, do you know what? They are not going to make it this year. I do not think they are going to make it to the floor of either House, either body, and I do not think that if they did, they would actually ever become law, because the peo-

ple are beginning to have their voices heard here, and it is great to see.

It is great to see some of my colleagues, who in the past have come up to me after I have made presentations like this, and said, "You know, Tom, you were right on this, but I could never support you, because I have this political problem in my district."

Now that political problem is becoming a problem for them if they do not support us in our efforts to reform immigration. That is the most amazing thing I can say. It is incredible. People's voices are being heard. The faxes, the e-mails and the calls, they are being heard. It takes time to change this body, to change their perspective point of view, but it is happening, and it is just the greatest thing I have seen in a long, long time.

The fact that few people are willing to pursue this, even the President of the United States after he made his speech in December has been unwilling to aggressively pursue this issue of amnesty and guest worker.

There is no reason to provide amnesty for anyone who has violated the law. There is no reason to do that. It only encourages, of course, more violations of the law. It is pretty logical to understand that. Either we are a Nation that respects the law and will in fact enforce it, or we should repeal it. We should not ignore it. We should not look the other way.

We should not pretend that when you bring an amendment to the floor that says we need to enforce the law against cities and States that are violating the law, we need to enforce it, we should not allow our colleagues to obfuscate the issue by saying things like, well, it is really a bad vote because our community would not get the money if they have the sanctuary city law. That is not a good idea. That is not a good idea, to reward illegal behavior. It is not a good idea to reward cities, it is not a good idea to reward people who violate the law.

I know that many of the people agree, millions of Americans from whom I hear on this issue and who are good enough to write and e-mail. It is just great, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you. You go back to the office and you get all these great e-mails from people in and out of your district, all over America. "I am listening to your immigration speech on C-SPAN. Your ideas are being heard. Keep up the good work. We need more people like you," blah, blah, blah. "Respectfully, Diane Furness from Minnetonka, Minnesota," and Rome, Georgia, and Weathered Rock Road in Jefferson City, Missouri, and Monroe, New York. All over America. These things come in night after night, day after day, and it is wonderful to see them.

It does recharge my battery, certainly, because I stand up here often on the floor of the House often, as I do tonight, by myself, in pursuit of this particular policy change. It is good to know that Americans do in fact watch

and do in fact care, and that they will in turn try their best to influence their elected representatives here.

That is what the process is all about. It is a good one. It does work. It does take time, and it sometimes seems so incredibly, incredibly slow, but it is happening, and that is the good news.

There is another bit of good news I wanted to give the people who are listening to this, Mr. Speaker. The Border Patrol and interior enforcement efforts help yield positive results, by the way, also increasing the ire of Mexican diplomats. Here is what is happening.

More than 150 suspected illegal aliens have been arrested by the Border Patrol in a sweep of newly created "interior checkpoints" in several Southern California communities, signaling a change in enforcement strategy. The sweeps, which began last week and are scheduled to continue indefinitely, targeted illegal aliens at public locations in communities as far as 100 miles north of the border. The order followed the August 2 arrest by the Border Patrol of five members of a Mexican family outside the Mexican consulate near downtown San Diego, all of whom were returned to Mexico.

□ 2130

The five who were en route to the consulate to apply for their matricula consular cards. I will explain what that is in a minute. Deputy Consul General Javier Diaz met with Chief Veal to protest the arrests, while Mexican Consul General Rodulfo Figueroa issued a statement saying he was astonished by the arrests because of their proximity to his office. Oh, my goodness. Could it possibly be that people who are here illegally are going to the Mexican consulate to get their matricula card? How can this be? I am shocked, as the line goes in the movie "Casablanca." I am shocked.

Mr. Speaker, it is idiotic to think the people would not be coming. In fact, they come in droves. The lines to the Mexican consulates, Guatemalan consulates and others who are handing out these sort of get-out-of-jail-free cards to their nationals living there, the lines are blocks long. They never were there before the government started handing out these cards and we started saying in cities and localities, they were called sanctuary cities, that we would accept them. What an amazing, amazing thing. Sure, we have people lined up to the Mexican consulate. Sure, they are here illegally. If you are here legally, you do not need the card. This is an ID card that is given to you by a foreign government, and then that foreign government tells us we have to accept it, and many of our cities and States do so as a form of ID.

Now, if you are here legally, Mr. Speaker, you have a form of ID that we gave you. It is called a green card or a visa or a stamp on your passport, something that the United States Government gives you to tell you that you are here legally. The only people who

need the matricula consular card are people who are here illegally. And, yes, they are lining up at Mexican consulates throughout the country.

Thank God somebody has decided to do something about it. I actually wrote a letter when this first started about a year ago, I wrote a letter to the Bureau of Immigration Control and Enforcement in my district, in my area, in Denver; and I suggested to them that this would be a perfect location for them to go with a big bus and just round up all of these people who are, in fact, there waiting in line, because 99.999 percent of them are here illegally. They said, well, what about that one-one thousandth of a percent of the number that might be here legally. We better not do it. Well, somehow, some way, they found a way to actually begin the operation of enforcing the law even as far as 100 miles inland, and I say, thank you, thank you, thank you. I say thank you to the Border Patrol, and I say thank you to the American public who have, in fact, forced this.

I assure my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, it would not be happening tonight if it were not for the tremendous pressure being placed on the Congress and on the administration to enforce the law. And it is happening, and there is this shift. Sometimes imperceptible, certainly not fast enough, but it is happening. This is the good news. We are actually arresting people who are here illegally, arresting them in places where they gather.

This has never happened before. In fact, in the past, Border Patrol agents were given a spot on the border, an X, literally, a big X, their car was parked there, they were told they could not move from that spot and that their only purpose was to try and stop people, try and intimidate people from actually coming across the line and walking by their car, by the Border Patrol car. It is idiotic, but that was the rule; and, in fact, many of them are still under that rule. And people said, are you crazy? That is not enforcing the law, that is making a mockery of it. I mean, we had Border Patrol agents who could watch people scurrying across the line and pass them; but they were told they could not leave the mark, the X.

Goofy? Yes. Idiotic? Yes. Frustrating? Enormously. Not just to those of us who care about immigration, but to the Border Patrol themselves. How would you like to have that job, Mr. Speaker? How would you like to be there all day long and told you have to sit on that spot and you cannot even arrest those who are running past you on the sides? You are there just as a sort of deterrent. If somebody looks at you and thinks, gee, I probably should not run right into that car, but if I run to the side of it either way, I am okay. Idiotic.

So now we are beginning to actually enforce the laws behind those spots. Now, it is only in one place, that is

true. It is in Southern California. I have great hope. And of course, what is happening? The immigration crowd, the open-borders crowd, the cult of multiculturalists, they are going crazy about this. I heard somebody say here the other day, a Member, I believe it was, that people were afraid to go to school or afraid to go to work or afraid to go to church because they might be rounded up by the Border Patrol. Well, of course, nobody is arresting people for being at church or at school; but I am glad that they are afraid to go, because it is beginning to sound as though we are actually threatening to and even taking steps to enforce the law.

Now, if that law is not a good law, if we should not in fact have such a law on the books, there is a way to handle that in this Republic. It is to, in fact, repeal it. That is the way to do it. Bring a law to the floor saying we should not enforce; well, we will simply repeal any law against people who are here illegally, because we need the cheap labor and we want the votes, and we want this country to be influenced by the cult of multiculturalism; and let us see if we can get it passed. If we get it passed, let us see if we can pass it in the other body, and if so, let us see if we can get the President to sign it. He may do it. Because there are a lot of people in this body and in the other body who believe that borders are, in fact, nothing of consequence, nothing that anybody should pay much attention to.

Well, there are people in this room that feel that way, but relatively few Americans feel that way. And night after night I would stand up here and talk about the fact that there is this huge gap between what the people of this country want and what this government is willing to provide for them in terms of border security. But do my colleagues know what, I say to my colleagues. That gap is narrowing. Again, slowly, but it is narrowing. The momentum is shifting to our side of this debate. These things make the difference. One night of these things, and then night after night after night after night, it does begin to make a difference.

I know that we are making a difference when I see that I and other Members are attacked in publications around the country, conservative, sometimes conservative Republican publications, but publications nonetheless that are committed to the concept of free, or cheap, labor, I should say. It is okay with me to be identified as the culprit here, as the bad guy, the guy who is trying to stop immigration. Well, it is not immigration. It is illegal immigration, and it is my desire to reduce dramatically the number of even legal immigrants because we need to get a handle on this problem.

The problem is enormous. It is bigger, in fact, than just the issue of jobs.

It is bigger than the issue of false identification at the voting booth. It is bigger than all of the costs of illegal immigration into the country, which are enormous; far, far greater, by the way, Mr. Speaker, than the "taxes" that these folks pay. Most of the people here are here providing labor that is low-skill and, therefore, low-wage labor. So even those who are paying taxes are paying a very small amount.

However, even those folks have learned how to scam the system. What they do is to claim, many of them, claim four or five or 10 children living in another country. The IRS will give them an ITIN, an Individual Taxpayer Identification Number, for each of those children. They then become dependents on the tax form, and so the person not only ends up paying no taxes because they paid relatively few in to begin with, a few dollars in to begin with, but then they get an earned income tax credit on top of it. So we pay people to come here and work illegally. All they have to do is use a fake Social Security number, turn in the 1040, and get their check.

We spend hundreds of millions, in fact billions, of dollars every single year providing the infrastructure for people who are here illegally. We provided for people whose children we educate in our K through 12 system, we provide it for children of illegals who come in here and send their kids even to higher education; and in many States they are allowed, or else the proposals are there, I should say, to allow them to be subsidized by the State. In many cases the State does not even check to see if anyone is a real legal citizen of this country, if they are here legally; and they will give them tuition, because they will get reimbursed by the State and the taxpayer. So there are billions of dollars going there. There are billions of dollars being spent in pursuit of health care benefits for people who are here illegally.

Not many people realize this, Mr. Speaker, but part of the bill that we passed here not too long ago, the very controversial bill known as the Medicare/prescription drug bill, not only created the biggest entitlement program since the creation of Medicare itself, thanks to your Republican Congress and President, but a part of that bill was a \$1 billion payment to hospitals for the treatment of illegal immigrants who are seeking health care. Mr. Speaker, \$1 billion in our Medicare bill. This is at a time, of course, when we have about a \$700 billion deficit in this country which will be extremely exacerbated by the creation of a new entitlement program and beyond that, \$1 billion. And the line item actually said for the care, for the medical care of illegal immigrants in this country, illegal aliens in the country.

We had a colleague here who used to say when he would read things like this or see things like that, "Beam me up, Mr. Speaker." I cannot be on the right

planet. I can certainly understand it. Beam me up. You really mean we are going to take \$1 billion out of a pot of money which actually does not exist, we are going to have to actually print or go to the bond pool and try to sell government bonds in order to get the money to pay it which, of course, creates a debt for the government; we are going to do that to pay for only \$1 billion and, by the way, the hospitals complained about that and said that is not nearly enough, but they are experiencing far, far heavier drains on their reserves to provide health care for illegal aliens. We are doing that, and that is a problem.

It is a problem for our environment. Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, the growth of this country, 90 percent of the growth is a result of immigration, both legal and illegal, and the progeny of people who come in here illegally; and a lot of people think that is good. That is where all the growth is coming from; that is great; we will have it. Well, there are really some very, very significant downsides to this thing called growth. If my colleagues do not believe that, just ask almost anyone in my neighborhood in Denver who are expatriates of California who have fled from the State of California, fleeing the growth in that State and fleeing all over the country, including Colorado, and, of course, making our problems with growth even more difficult: schools, hospitals, highways, housing. When you are stuck on the highway anywhere in this country, you have to ask yourself, how is it that the country is growing this quickly if we actually have a fairly stable birth rate? There is one reason, it is called immigration, both legal and illegal. That is the source of almost all of the growth in this country.

Along with that growth, of course, as I say, comes some big problems in terms of the environment. People coming into this country illegally have essentially destroyed large chunks of our pristine desert area along the southern border. Millions upon millions of feet going across that border have created thousands of foot paths that will not be something that can be overcome by the natural environment for centuries. They have driven their cars into the desert. They have polluted the water resources in the area. They gather in places called pickup sites where they discard their belongings and their clothes, many times, much of their clothing. A lot of human waste accumulates there while they wait to be picked up by a truck that would bring them farther inland. Sometimes these places are areas where thousands have gathered along the southern border. I have been there. I have gone through them.

□ 2145

And they are creating tremendous environmental problems that, of course, neither the EPA, that is another proposal that we have in the

works, Mr. Speaker, is to require an environmental impact statement on immigration. Would not it be fascinating to know how immigration is, in fact, affecting our environment?

Strangely, I have not heard a positive response from the EPA or from the Sierra Club. I am sure that it is forthcoming. I am sure that, any day now, they are going to say to me, Congressman, we are so happy that you are trying to do something about the environment and we are going to even score this, if it ever gets to the floor, we will score it in favor, it is a vote in favor of the environment if we actually require an environmental impact statement on immigration. We have a bill like that. I will not take any bets about how quickly that will be allowed to come to the floor, or even be heard, of course, but I would love to see it.

Because it is just great to point out the hypocrisy of the establishment on this issue. The people that come into our committee, the Committee on Resources on which I sit and talk about the degradation of the land, and they will talk about it as long as one does not bring up what immigration is doing to the land, one does not bring up the hundreds of thousands of acres that have been burned along our southern border by people who have come in illegally they make camp fires, move on in the morning, camp fire, of course, gets out of control, burns hundreds of thousands of acres, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, California. Nobody says anything about that.

I would venture a guess, Mr. Speaker, that most of the people listening tonight do not know about the environmental degradation of our land as a result of illegal immigration into the country, but it is enormous. It is horrendous.

Now, that is a problem and, of course, national security is a problem when it comes to illegal immigration. The fact that we continue to press for open borders, we continue to say that people should not come into this country, or we continue to say that we will not restrict the flow of illegal immigration, creates huge problems for us in the standpoint of national security.

Over the weekend, I was on the northern border. And about 20 or 30 miles north of Bonner's Ferry, Idaho, we went and talked to the Customs officials there at the port of entry and talked about the problems they face, talked about the fact that we have been able to do a much better job of creating a much more secure border crossing at the ports of entry. But, of course, all that means that all those miles between ports of entry, and there are thousands of miles, are completely open or, at least for the most part, open.

So as you make it more difficult to come into this country illegally through a port of entry, naturally, people will seek the weakest link in your defenses and those are the places between the ports of entry. And they are still coming.

We are still seeing people who are paying upwards of \$50,000 to be smuggled into the United States. Now, these are people, almost all of whom are from the Middle East or from Asia. You have to ask yourself, Mr. Speaker, why would anybody pay \$50,000 to be smuggled into the United States? It is not to work the local 7-Eleven store. No. It is probably to do something very bad once you get here and you do not want to be known as having come across the border. So you will not go to the port of entry.

It is one of those things that kids would do, when you would say do you think if you want to come into this country illegally you will go through a port of entry and they would go, "Duh? Are you crazy? Of course not. Stupid?" No. One would go around it. That is right. That is what they do. So it is good that we have, in fact, made our ports of entry more secure. It is idiotic that we refuse to make the miles of border in between them more secure.

So people are coming into this country with very bad, very bad things on their mind to do to us. Of course, there is the question. People talk about the illegal immigration being important for the economy. Well, let me tell you what it does to the economy. Massive importation of cheap labor is a very, very, very bad phenomenon and has a negative effect on low skilled, low wage American workers because it depresses their wage rates.

And one can look at any of the information we have, the statistical information we have on this and one will see that low income Americans have not seen an increase in their wages. So people come here to the floor and demand that we artificially increase them by increasing the minimum wage. But, of course, if we allowed the market to work, restricted the flow of cheap labor, you would see an increase, a natural increase in the wage rates of people who are here and who are poor.

Because, of course, if one wants to really and truly be a purist about that kind of economics, one would say that, as the President said, we should allow, for every single person who wants to work, find an employer who wants to employ them.

Well, if one thinks about that, at first it sounds perfectly logical and right and good, but if one thinks about it for a minute, one has to realize that there are, of course, billions of people out there on the other side of the world or on our borders who, in fact, are willing and desirous of a job, a job presently held by an American citizen for X number of dollars, and these people are willing to come here and take it for X minus something.

And then, of course, if one moves a little farther out to other parts of the Third World, there are more people who are willing to come and replace those who just came in at an even lower rate. So naturally, this massive immigration, legal and illegal, has a detrimental effect on low income earners in America.

It also, frankly, when we do things like export high tech jobs or import high tech workers from India or anywhere else on the abuse of the H-1B or L-1 visa, what that does, of course, is to actually also put a damper on the wages for middle income people, higher income people. This does not help us. It helps certain companies, that is true. It does not help America.

And so we look at the economic implications of massive immigration, we look at the environmental implications, we look at the national security implications. One comes to the conclusion, I think, if one looks at all of these things in an objective way, one comes to the conclusion that there is at least the room for debate as to whether or not immigration is all that good, or if we should not control it much more effectively than we do, even if it is good. Should we not know who is coming in, for what purpose, and for how long they are going to be here?

So there are a whole bunch of reasons why we should all be concerned about immigration into this country, especially illegal immigration. But there is one that is even more significant, an issue that I think is overriding all of it. And that is the fact that there is something else happening in America that deserves our attention. We are as a Nation becoming less and less sure of who we are. We are being more and more confused about what the idea of being an American really is. We are being pressured constantly by the cult of multiculturalism.

To suggest that there is nothing good or valuable about Western civilization or that everything that we represent to the world is a negative, and that our efforts have been, generally speaking, unproductive at the best, and, probably, at the worst they have been detrimental to the benefit of humanity, this is what we put in the textbooks. This is what we teach children. This is what our movies show us. This is a phenomena that is absolutely fascinating to watch.

There was a book written in the 1970s, and I read it, it was by a gentleman by the name of Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. He is a liberal. I am a conservative. But I must admit to you this was a captivating book in many ways because of what it said about who we are. And the title of the book that you can still get, I am sure, in fact, I got another one just a couple of months ago, the title of the book is, "The Disuniting of America" by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

He is talking about the multiculturalist phenomena that everything where we go and everything we see is designed to split us apart in America instead of pulling us together. That we will become divided into all of these subgroups, these Balkanized ethnic groups or some group victimized in their own minds and divided up so that it becomes harder and harder to understand what America is really all about.

In fact, it becomes harder and harder to identify those ideas and ideals that hold us all together as Americans.

He talked about this 30 years ago. There have been books subsequent to that written by people like Samuel Huntington. Mr. Huntington, one of his books in the 1990s was called "The Clash of Civilizations." It talks about this. His most recent book that came out last month is called, "Who Are We?" I recommend it to anyone who has an interest in this issue, anyone who thinks about this issue beyond the most superficial level.

Who are we as Americans? Do we really know? Are we really and truly doing those things that are designed to have everybody who is here, whether they are from Azerbaijan or Zimbabwe, regardless of the country of origin with redoing those things that encourage people who come here as immigrants and people who are born here and in our school systems, are we doing those things that encourage those people to connect with the idea of America? Are we telling them that they should stay separate? Are we telling them that they will teach them in their own language even if that language is not English? Yes, of course, we are.

Are we encouraging them to keep their political affiliations to other countries, not just the United States? Yes, in fact, we are. We now have somewhere near 10 million people it is estimated who live in this country with dual citizenships. We are seeing other countries in the world take advantage of this cult of multiculturalism that permeates our societies.

We are seeing, in fact, the President of Mexico who was here just a few days ago, June 18, this is an article out of the Phoenix paper, Mexico City, "Mexican President Vicente Fox announced Tuesday he planned to send a bill to Congress asking law makers to give Mexicans living abroad the right to vote in their elections in Mexico in 2006." Currently, Mexicans have to return to their home country to vote.

More than 20 million people of Mexican heritage live in the United States, and half of those are Mexican born. Mr. Fox also came here to the United States just a few days ago and was essentially campaigning here in America for votes from the Mexican American community or I should just perhaps say Mexican community, because I do not know what attachment they have to America. But he is telling them that they should not attach to America, that they should retain their political ties to Mexico, vote in Mexican elections.

Now, why is he doing this? I will tell you. There are a couple of reasons. One is that he wants them here in the United States, he wants to encourage more people to come from Mexico to the United States, but he also wants to make sure that when they get here they continue to have an allegiance to Mexico and therefore they will send home remittances, the money I was

talking about earlier, the money that is made by people who work here but sent home that now accounts for about \$15 billion to the Mexican government and the Mexican economy.

And now it is higher, that is a greater amount than any other foreign investment in the country. It is greater than the amount invested by tourists in Mexico. It is second only in terms of the dollars brought into the country to PEMEX who is their Mexican-owned, government-owned oil company.

So do you now understand why President Fox was here in the United States essentially campaigning for his presidency by asking people here to remain connected to Mexico and complaining, by the way, about their rights that he says are being violated by the United States? And that he says I will take up this issue of your rights here with the President of the United States, the rights of people who have violated the law to come into the country to begin with.

□ 2200

It is true that anybody here certainly has a certain degree of human rights. They have the right to life, but in terms of all the other "rights of citizenship," the right to vote, the right to get driver's licenses, the right to send your children to higher education, all those are supposedly reserved for people who are here legally, whether they came from Mexico or Guatemala or Hungary or Italy or China, wherever they came from. If they came here legally, they have a right to all of those things.

If you come here illegally, the question is what are your rights, and certainly it is not the business of the President of Mexico or any other foreign government to come in here and lecture us about the "rights" we are providing or not providing to citizens from other countries. I would just end by saying, if they are coming here illegally, there is a solution to the problem. They can return. If their rights are being violated, they can return home. They are not doing that.

IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we come tonight again, the group that is styled the Iraq Watch, or a group of my colleagues and myself who are committed to continue to bring accountability to this administration's policies in Iraq, to fulfill Congress' oversight responsibility to not allow administration mistakes in Iraq to go unheeded and have no accountability for them; and we are here tonight, and I expect the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) and others will join me in this discussion.

We have been doing this now for several months; and tonight, as on many

nights, I have great sadness walking over here to speak this evening. Just as I was leaving my apartment, I saw on the news that we have lost two more great American warriors in the service of their country in Iraq, and I do not know who these gallant Americans were. I do not know where they are from. I do not know what happened to end their lives in Iraq, but I do know this: those two proud and honorable Americans deserved a President of the United States who told the truth to the American people before he started this war that resulted in the tragedy of these two people losing their lives.

I know that this Congress has a solemn obligation to hold this administration accountable if, in fact, it is true that this administration did not tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth to the American people before this war started; and tonight, if we seem a bit angry about this situation, it is because on our minds and on our hearts are the death of these two American soldiers and those who have gone before and those who will come after.

Our duty, as we see it tonight, is to discuss the manifold failure of this administration to, one, tell the truth in Iraq; and, two, to pursue a policy that would reduce the danger to our service personnel serving in Iraq, and our discussion will proceed on those lines.

Now, let me start, if I can, on this fundamental question: Did the President of the United States of America fully level with the American people before he started this war? That is the question. If the answer is no, we think that is one of the greatest assaults to democracy that could possibly happen.

There are many things that can go wrong in a democracy, but I would assert that the most serious affront to democratic principles of a representative government is for the elected leadership to start a war based on false information. Nothing, nothing can be a more serious breach of the solemn obligations when one takes the oath of office than to start a war based on falsehood, and we are here tonight to answer the question of whether or not that occurred.

So let me start at the beginning of the Iraq war. The President of the United States asserted that America should start this war in Iraq based on two fundamental pillars, and his entire rationale for this war was based on these two pillars. He was successful in convincing a large majority of the American people that those two pillars were both factual, and those two pillars were these two:

Number one, the President asserted that Iraq possessed wholesale amounts of weapons of mass destruction which presented a threat to the United States of America and our personal and our family's security. He told the American people that time after time after time. This statement was false. This fundamental pillar of this war was false.

This President told us and stood right behind me and told the American people that we had information, the British had information that, in fact, Iraq had obtained yellow cake to extract uranium from it to build a nuclear weapon. That statement was false; and most importantly, the White House knew it was false. The White House had been told it was false. The White House had sent an emissary to Africa to check the accuracy of this statement, and Ambassador Joe Wilson who served proudly, who the first President Bush described as a hero during the first Persian Gulf War, came back and told the White House this statement was false. Two soldiers died today in Iraq based on a falsehood that was given to the American people that the White House knew was false. This pillar did not stand.

The President of the United States told us that Iraq had drones that could fly across the Atlantic, apparently, and spray Americans with biological and chemical weapons, and this scared the living pants off people in America who heard this, as it should have, and as the White House knew that it would. Unfortunately, now that reports are peeled away, we have found out that even our own Air Force told the White House this statement was false; that they were kind of balsam wood things meant to take pictures of troop movements and the like.

So the first pillar upon which the President of the United States sent soldiers to their death was false. So let us examine the second pillar, if I can, for a moment, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

The second pillar upon which the President's scaffolding of falsehood was built was a clear assertion that led to a significant majority, seven out of 10 Americans, to believe that Iraq was associated, was behind the attack on this country of September 11, and the President was successful, again, in creating this impression. He was successful in convincing seven out of 10 Americans that Saddam Hussein was behind these heinous, vile, indeed evil, attacks on America of 9/11. But it was not true. It was not true.

Now, we know it was not true because a bipartisan commission has come back and stated categorically there is no credible evidence; and I want to read the quote to make sure I get it right: "We have no credible evidence that Iraq and al Qaeda cooperated on attacks against the United States."

Yet, seven out of 10 Americans were convinced by this White House that Saddam Hussein was behind these attacks on America. Where did Americans get that misimpression? Did they get it from Dan Rather? Did they get it from the New York Times? Did they get it from the Shopping Channel? No. They got it from the President of the United States, who led these people to